

**REMARKS**

Claims 26, 28, 30, 31, 33-35, and 37 have been amended. Claims 26-28, 30-35, 37, 38, and 40-48 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 26-28, 30-35, 37, 38, 40, and 44-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 97/20434 ("Denyer"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 26 recites "an interpolator located in the substrate and configured to estimate the level of the first spectral component in the light received by at least one of the second photosensitive sites based on at least one measurement of the first spectral component obtained respectively by at least one of the first photosensitive sites." Denyer does not disclose this feature. To the contrary, Denyer only refers to "a processing unit 28" that "preferably also interpolates the red, green, and blue channel signals to form synchronous, parallel colour channel signals for the video signal  $V_{RGB}$  before being output to the display unit 30." (Denyer, page 12, lines 8-14). Denyer does not describe how the processing unit 28 interpolates the red, green, and blue channel signals or what data is used for the interpolation. Furthermore, the recitation of claim 26 is not necessarily inherent to the processing unit 28 of Denyer. For example, the processing unit 28 of Denyer might interpolate a value of a first spectral component in a first photosensitive site using other first spectral photosensitive sites.

Since Denyer does not disclose all the limitations of claim 26, claim 26 is not anticipated by Denyer. Claims 37 and 44 include limitations similar to those of claim 26 and are allowable for the same reason. Claims 27, 28, and 30-35 depend from claim 26 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 38 and 40 depend from claim 37 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 45-48 depend from claim 44 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,851 (“Acharya”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 41 depends from claim 37 and is patentable over Denyer for at least the reasons mentioned above. Acharya, which has been cited as allegedly teaching the use of 24 bits, does not cure the deficiencies of Denyer discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,953 (“Okada”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 42 and 43 depend from claim 37 and are patentable over Denyer for at least the reasons mentioned above.

Furthermore, claim 37 recites “an interpolator located in the substrate and configured to receive digital data representing the spectral component levels measured in the first photosensitive sites and the second photosensitive sites, and to estimate the level of the first spectral component in the light received by at least one of the second photosensitive sites based on at least one digitized measurement of the first spectral component obtained respectively by at least one of the first photosensitive sites.” Okada does not disclose this feature. To the contrary, Okada only refers to a process by which signal components from pixels of the same type (color) are interpolated to generate weighted averages of a single pixel of that same type (color). (Okada, column 6, lines 51-65). Okada does not teach or suggest estimating “the level of the first spectral component in the light received by at least one of the second photosensitive sites based on at least one digitized measurement of the first spectral component obtained respectively by at least one of the first photosensitive sites” as recited by claim 37. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 29 , 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

David T. Beck

Registration No.: 54,985

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant